G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

LR: 13-1886

1891-1892

~~191~~.

(LR)

File No. 22

Serial Nos. 1—10

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(30)

Serial Nos. 1—10

Part B for June 1899

SUBJECT.

Allotment of land as Service Inam to the Toti of Ramaganapalli village, Chickballapur Taluk.

Countermarked

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

Mte Cont.d & Rev.d

~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

REVENUE BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT. Allotment of land as Service Inam to the Toti of the Ramaganapartha village, Premasagar hobli of the Chikkaballapur taluk.

LAST REFERENCE. Letter No. 1226/337 dated 18th September 98 from Dy: Commr. Kolar Dt.

The godidar of the godi Ramaganapartha village, Premasagar hobli of the Chikkaballapur ~~hobli~~ Taluk, having failed to pay Government dues, the godi village in question was resumed to Government. (Govt. Ro: No 1084-5/5-3 dy 12-5-88.)

2. When the village was on godi

godi Lanne, the Jodiar, has given, the marginally noted lands (x) as Inam, for Joti Service. At the time of Settlement, these inam lands were fully assessed by the Survey Department.

(x).

Survey No.	description.	Extent. a.g.	assess Rs.
	dry	2-12	3-8-0.
15	dry	1-8	1-8-0.
26	wet	1-25	10-0-0.
	Total	4-38	15-0-0

1883-4.

3. The Dy: Com[illegible] stated that it was not clear on what principle the Joties of other villages ~~have~~ had been endowed with Service Inam land [illegible] recommended the a[illegible] as Service Inam, [illegible] lands held by the Joti Inam formerly.

vide Sl 4(a) Part II in the file

Dy: Com's No: 343/75 Dy 21-4-92

4. On receipt of the above, the Dy: Commr was called upon to furnish information on the following points:—

x Sl No (6) No 1176/R719-92 Dy 1-7-92.

of cultivable lands in the village:-

(2) the area and assessment of lands under occupation.

(3) with what Govt village, has the O[illegible] [illegible]kh village of Ram-ganap[illegible] [illegible] question, been amalgamated.

(4) Are the Service [illegible] separate Toti actually re[illegible] [illegible] for the Bechirakh vill[illegible]

(5) Are there any oth[illegible] village Officers who enjoy emolu-ments in lands or money, attached to the Bechirak village?

(6) If a separate Toti is con-sidered

Appendix [illegible]

considered necessary why the land in occupation be should be not be remune- cultivated. This will not at- rated in kind by the right to tract a man to undertake the who are benefited by this Service. There is, however no gua- Services. rantee that all the occupied land will be cultivated and the grain remuneration may fluctuate with the area under cultiva- tion.

5. The Dy: Commissioner re- No. 616/1320 D 12-8-92.
-plied to the above quer- -ies, as shown on the mar- -gin, in red ink

6. The Dy: Commissioner, was also called upon to sub- -mit a statement in a prescribed form, showing the extent, revenue &c, of the surrounding 10 villages and the value of the Swan land assigned to the Jotiers thereof

Sl No 16.
No. 7015 D 19-11-92.
R.J. 19-9-92

4

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

them of with revised proposals if necessary for the allotment of Service Inam lands in favour of the Zoti of the village in question.

No. 1226/337 dt 18-9-98

The Dy. Commr. submits the required statement and states that the allotment as Service Inam of Survey No. 20, measuring 6 A. 5 G. at Rs 8-8-0 is sufficient.

This I think may be sanctioned

Submitted to Secretary for orders

7/1/99

May be sanctioned

but don't you note the absence of any action between 1898 & 1898 an interval of 6 years. Wherever the papers during the interval & who is responsible for the delay. The office may give dates for the different stages

Submd to Hon'ble E. Du

1-1-99

R. 14/1/99.

(113)

Draft sanction please

Why were the papers so long in the Secretariat? Who is responsible?

Note — It has been sanctioned before

through which
the subject has
passed

Mr Quetchenchery
Mr Pelly Esq
Capt Robertson Esq

3.

9 As regards the delay noticed above, the Dyebommr was requested to report where the papers were during the period between 1892 and 1898, and who are the officials responsible for the delay.

No 5342-3 / 2.7.19.92 Pro. 4. 8-2-99

From the Amildar's report received with the Dyebommr's letter No 4573/1004 of 14/5/99, it is observed that on the 4th December 1892 the papers were referred to Taluk Gumasta Lakshmankao

6

for the preparation of a Statement called for vide this office No. 7015 & 27.1.1992 19th November 1892, & that the Gumasta had the papers with him upto the 5th January 1897. on which date the Statement was sent by the Taluk to the District office. Aga .. from March 1897 to April 1898, the papers were delayed by Lakshmanrao for the 1st 6 mont, and by Gumasta Venkat-Subbaiya for the next 6 months. The Dy Commr. states that he has punished Lakshman Rao with a fine of Rs. 10/. & that the other Gumasta Venkatsubbaiya was convicted in the recent riot case at Chikballa-pur & has been under-going imprisonment in the Bangalore

Central Jail

Advocate Solicited as to whether the Dy Commr's letter may be recorded.

submitted to secretary
1/6/99

Yes
2/6/99

S.S. for draft 2/6/99

Draft sub'd
SS 3/6/99

Account Branch
25/4/92

Recd
26/4/92
Draft Sub
1/7/92

Section LR
File No 22-1911
Serial No 1

(General Serial No. 30.)

(4)

189

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
773
25 APR 92

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore

Dated 21 } Camp Royalpad
Despatched 23 } April 1892
Received

Enclosures No. 141 file

General No. 343
No. 75 1892-93.

Has the honor to submit herewith for sanction a statement shewing State lands to be alienated to one Loti Madda as service inam in the Ramagampatti village Chickballapur Taluk.

The vernacular papers connected with the case are herewith submitted for further information and obliging return when no longer required

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

131 91

Statement showing State Lands proposed to be alienated in Settled Taluk.

District.	Taluk.	Magani	Village, Estate or Township.	As per village accounts. Survey No.	Area in acres.	Assessment.	Occupied or waste as per Village Form 1 Khetawar patarak	Particulars of grant. In what Survey No.	Extent of land.	Assessment.	Class of alienation or grant to private individuals compensated or party in whose name alienated.	Whether old village site is to be assessed a new site being granted or whether the new grant is only to extend old village site.	For sanction. Authority sanctioning alienation.	No. and date of order.	REMARKS.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Kolar	Chikballapur	Bangarapet	Ramagunpatte	Dry No 7	A-G 2-12	Rs-A-P 3-8-0	Occupied by Toti madda, and others	7	A G 2 12	Rs-A-P 3-8-0	Toti madda for permanently his Toti service	Not			Ramagunpatte which was an inam, was enfeudised Jodi village, was resumed to Govt. owing to the failure of the Jodidar to pay Govt. dues vide Proceedings No. 1084-5/52 dated 12th May 1888. When the village was held on Jodi tenure, the Jodidar had given the applicant the lands shown in his statement as Inam for Toti Service as there was no Jari Inam attached to the village. At the time of settlement, these lands were fully assessed by the Survey Department, and the same are now held by the Toti on Kandayam. The villagers state that the service Toti is essential for their village. The Toti prays that the lands may be granted which as Inam for his service. It is not clear on what principle that the Totis of other villages are endowed with service Inam lands as the area differs in every village. The Survey No. 15 has to be subdivided as it is held by more than one individual. Under these circumstances, the lands which he formerly held by the Toti as Inam are recommended to be granted to him as service Inam permanently permitting the assessment thereof.
				Wet No 26	1-25	10-0-0		26	2 12	3-8-0					
				Dry No 15	6-24	9-8-0		15	1 25	10-0-0					
					10-21	23-0-0			1 1	1-8-0					
									Total 4	38	15-0-0				

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated Camp Royalpad 21st April 1892

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—27-7-91.—303.

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

(6)

Section 1 (2)

File No

Serial No

To The Dy. Commr
Kolar District

Dated 18th July 1892

Despatched 22

Received

Enclosures No. V.P

General No. 1176

R.F. 19-92 (5224)

His docket No 343/75 dated 21st April 1892, submitting for sanction a statement shewing the particulars of certain lands which it is proposed to allot as Service Inam to the Poti of the Ramaganparti village of the Chikballapur Taluk

With reference to the above, has the honor to request information the following points

(1). the area of cultivable in the village

(2). the area

assessment of lands
at present under occupa-
-tion.

(3). With what Govt village
has the Bechirakh village
of Ramaganpatti been
amalgamated as directed
in Pro: No. $\frac{1084-5}{53}$ of
12th May 1885?

(4). Are the services of a
separate Toti actually
required for the Bechirakh village?

(5). ~~What~~ Are there any village
officers who enjoy emoluments
in land or money attached
to the Bechirakh village?

(6) If a separate Toti is
considered necessary, why
~~should he~~ not be remunerated
kind by the Ryots who
benefited by his
services, in accordance with
to $\frac{3335-62}{62}$ of the 18th August 1882?

If so, such
Kanarese papers recd from the
Chairman MRK
18/7/82

Please show me
these papers
before issue
Mg
attested
W.G.

Dep

Date

Rev Order 17/8

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892.

(10)

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Section L2
File No 22-1891
Serial No 3

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 12th August 1892.

Despatched 16th

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & file

General No. 616
No. 132

In reply to.

SUBJECT.

Docket No. 1176 / R.F. 19-92 dated the 4th Sept. 1892, calling for further information in regard to a proposal to allot Inam lands as Service Inam to the Toti of Ramagana-parti village in Chickballapur Taluk

With reference to the

References (to be entered on in the Dewan's Office).

Recd 18/8

Sd. Sd. with draft
17/11

I have the honor to submit the accompanying copy of the Chick-ballapur Sub Division Officer's letter No: 136 of the 7th instant on the subject and to request that under the circumstances therein explained, the alienation recommended may be sanctioned.

The Tenancular papers connected with the case as per accompanying Ferist are also enclosed for further reference and obliging return when no longer required.

Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

S. the

No: 136 Ex: 1 Cau. file

Chickballapur.
Dated 7th August 1872.
Despatched 9th — do —

Enclo 3

From

The Sub Division Officer
Chickballapur.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Sir,

With reference to your No: 304/200 dated the 29th/30th ultimo regarding the question of the appointment of a Toty to the village of Ramaganaparthy in the Chickballapur Taluk I have the honor to give below in juxta-position the queries of the Chief Secretary and answers thereto.

Query	Answer.
Query (1) The area and assessment of cultivable lands in the village	(1) 96 Acres and 31 Goontas bearing an assessment of Rs 241-0-0
Query (2) The area and assessment of lands at present under occupation.	60 Acres 37 Goontas bearing an assessment of Rs 186-12-0.
(3) With what Government village has	The village is a separate Survey Manje but forms together with the Purnasagara

Ramagaunpurti been amalgamated as directed in Proceedings No. 1084-5/53 dated 12th May 1885?	Kere and Belegire, each of them a separate Mouji, one Shanbhogue charge. They are also under one Patel.
(4) Are the services of a separate Toty actually required for the Bechirakh village?	A separate Toty is necessary. When the village was on Jodi tenure, the Jodidar had given to a Toty wet land assessed at Rs 10 and dry land assessed at Rs 5 as Inam. Since the resumption of the village, these lands have been fully assessed and are in the possession of the former Toty. It is proposed that these lands may be confirmed, as Inam subject only to the payment of Local and Irrigation cess, the latter in the case of wet land.
(5) Are there any other village officers who enjoy emoluments in land or money, attached to the Bechirakh village?	No. The Patel gets a Potgi in cash of Rs 12-12-2 and the Shanbogue of Rs 14-3-6.

separate Toty is considered necessary, why should he not be remunerated in kind by the Ryots who are benefited by his services, in accordance with Proceedings No: $\frac{3335}{62}$ of the 1st August 1878?

The Toty can only get about 200 seers of grain even if all the land in occupation be cultivated. This will not attract a man to undertake the service. There is however no guarantee that all the occupied land will be cultivated and the grain remuneration may fluctuate with the area under cultivation.

(2 On the whole therefore it is desirable to have a separate Toty and give him the dram land in addition to the grain remuneration. The Amildar's original report on the subject together with the file of correspondence forwarded with your communication is enclosed.

I have &c.

(Signed) A. Krishnasamy Iyengar.
Sub Division Officer

"Copy"

Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District

Name of Village. | Total Extent of assessed land. 2 | Total assessment. 3 | Extent of plain under occupation 4 | Assessment of the land under occupation. 5 | Extent of dessa allowances to the Zoti. 6 | assessment of the land. 7

Section 1RD
File No 2/1/1547
Serial No 4

20

The Deputy Commissioner
of the Kolar District.

Dated

No 7015
RJ 19-92 DJ 19-11-92
24.
(1050)

His No. 616/132 of the 12th August 1892,
Submitting further information
in regard to a proposal
to allot certain lands
as Service Inam, to the
Zoti of Ramagunapaete
in the Chikballapur Taluk.

With reference to the
above, requests the
Deputy Commissioner
will be good enough
to submit a statement
~~Showing the~~ in the marginally
noted form, showing the

extent and revenue dem of the surrounding 10 Villages ~~with~~ and the value of the Inam land assigned to the Totes thereof with revised proposals if necessary for the allotment of Service Inam lands in favour of the Tote of the Ramagumparti Village

Broadea

Mrk
19/11/92
Under Secy.

R.M

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No.
No.

Draft for ... G

Gen. 31.]

1898 No. 5613

Genl Records
please put up the file
2/7/98.

R. F. No 19 of 92 putup
4/7/98

4/7/98

From The Deputy Commissioner —
Kolar District

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
Revenue and General Depttts

Submitted with draft.

Dated 29.6.98.

Despatched —do—

Received

General No. 4405 } 1897.98
No. 1305

Enclosure No. —

Section
File No
Serial No

His No 7018 (16) dated 19th Novem-
R.7.19-92
-ber 92, Calling for certain parti-
-culars with reference to the
proposal for allotting certain
lands as service Inam to the
Toli of Ramagana parti, —
Chickballapur Taluk —

Has the honor to request
that the records submitted with
this office his 616 (10) dated 12th
312
August 92, may be kindly —
returned, as the same have not
been received with the Govern-
-ment Order under reference.

W. Thackeray
Ag Deputy Commissioner —
Kolar

5/7.

15

(22)

To

The Dy: Commissioner.

Kolar District.

Section
File No
Serial No 6

No. 228. / R.7. 19-92 — 9-6-98.

The Dy: Commissioner

docket No. 4405/1305 (Serial no. 21) dated

29th June 1898.

Has the honor to return, as requested in the above, the Vernacular records ~~submitted~~ read, with his docket No. 616/312 dated 12th August 1898 in connection with the Service Inam lands of the Sati of Ramagondanahalli village in the Chikkaballapur Taluk. "By order"

Before Case Cons. Mr. Collector

7/7/98

7/7/98 for Secy.

To

The Dep. missions

~~Bangalore~~

14

Gen. 31.]

1898-99

Section 210
File No 22-1898
Serial No 7

From The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.

To

The Secretary to the ~~Board~~ Government of Mysore, Revenue and General Department.

Dated 18th
Despatched 19th } September 1898
Received

General No. 1226 } 1898-99
No. 337

Enclosure No. 2 & a file of papers.

Submitting a report as called for with necessary particulars in regard to a proposal to allot certain lands as service inam to the Toti of Ramaganapalli village in the Chikballapur Taluk.

Read 23/9

Rev 20/9

Notes enclosed

24/9 27/9 Memo submitted. 6/1/99

2810

Kolar District,
Deputy Commissioner's Office.

No. 1226/337 Sn. 2 & a file of papers. Dated, Camp Malur, the 18th September 1898.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir,

In continuation of the correspondence ending with your docket no. 228, dated the 9th July 1898, calling for further information in regard to a proposal to allot certain lands as service inam to the toti of Ramaganaparti in the Chikballapur taluk, I beg to submit herewith as required a statement showing the extent, assessment &c. of the surrounding villages and the value of the inam lands assigned to the toties thereof. Sl. no (22)

2. Copies of the marginally noted English correspondence are enclosed. Under the circumstances represented by the Sub-Division Officer in para 1 of his docket no. 119, dated the 11th September 1898, the assignment of the land assessed at Rupees 8-8-0 to the toti of the said village is considered sufficient.

(1) No. 590 dated 29.5.98 from the Sub-Division Officer
(2) No. 4120/2521 dated 6.6.98 to Sub-Division Officer.
(3) No. 119 dated 11.9.98 from —do—

3. The vernacular file received with your docket quoted above is resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Venkatarama
Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

U.

1897-98

(1) From

The Sub-Divisional Officer
Chikballapur

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

Dated 29th } May 1898
Recd. 31st }

General No. 590.

Enclosure - 1 file.

His memo No. 1632/1075 dated 28/30th November 1892 forwarding for compliance, Chief Secretary's docket No. 7015 Sl. No. 16 without date & 7. 19-92 requesting submission of a statement showing the extent and revenue &c. of the 10 villages surrounding Ramagana-parthi village of Chikballapur Taluk, specifying therein the value of the inam lands also assigned to the toti, thereof together with revised proposals, if necessary, for the allotment of Service inam lands in favor of the toti of Ramagana-parthi.

the lands recommended to be alienated for Poli Service Inam in the said village in 1892 are stated to be in extent 4 acres and 38 gunta with an assessment of Rupees 15, whereas the extent of such lands entered in the statement now received is 6 acres and 3 gunta with an assessment of Rupees 8-8-0. The attention of the Sub-Division Officer is drawn to the discrepancies noted above and it is requested that the same may either be rectified and a fresh statement submitted or explained without further delay as the reference pending for over 6 years.

It is further requested that the vernacular papers of 1892 may also be forwarded as they do not appear to have been returned with his docket under reff.

Signed K. P. Puttannaphetty
Dy Commissioner
Kolar District.

Assessment of lands under occupation } Rs 200-12-0

Extent of lands under occupation } 71 acres.

As entered in the statement now received } 186-12-0

As entered in letter no 136 dated 7th August 1892 } 60-37

(3) 1898-99

From The Sub Divisional Officer
Chikballapur

To The Deputy Commissioner,

Dated 11th
Despatched 12th } September 1898.

Enclosures. 1 file of Kanarese papers.

General No. 119.

His docket No. 4120/2521 dated the 6th June last returning for explanation the statement and the vernacular records connected with the question of allotting certain toti inam lands for Ramagana-parthi village, Chikballapur Taluk with the observation that the figures furnished in the statement submitted with the docket under reply differed from that reported in this office letter No. 136 dated 7th August 1892.

	Assessment R. A. P.	Sub-div. A. G.	Survey No.	Particulars
	3-8-	2-12	7	Dry
	1-8-	1-1	Sub No. 2 of 15	Dry
	10--	1-25	26	Wet
	15--	4-38		

In resubmitting herewith the entire file of Canarese correspondence ending with Chikballapur Amildar's Dilla No. 215 dated 5th instant, has the honor to report that from the Amildar's Arzi No. 166 dated the 20-8-98 it will be seen that when the village was a Jodi, the toti had been given for his service the marginally [illegible] 4 acres and 38

gunlas with an assessment of
15-a-o which were fully assessed at
the Survey settlement without allotting
any inam to his service. The toti
therefore applied to the Deputy
Commissioner for the restoration of these
lands as a remuneration for his service
and these lands were then recommended
to be alienated for toti's service inam.
As the matter was under correspondence
for a long time pending sanction of Govern-
ment toti mudda sold these lands
to others except Paiki no. 2 of Survey no. 15,
and discontinued his service. The village
being a small one in lieu of the 4 acres
and 38 gunlas with an assessment of
Rupees 15/. formerly selected, Survey no.
20 measuring 6 acres and 3 gunlas
assessed at Rupees 8-8-0 was considered
sufficient remuneration and its grant was
recommended

2. The discrepancy in the statement as
to the extent of lands under occupation
is reported to be due to more lands coming
under holding through durkhasts.

under the cover of Deputy Commissioners

No. 265/196 dated 15th July 1898 is also attached.

Signed K. Doraisami Iyer –
Sub Divisional Officer,
Chikballapur

" Copies

Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar district.

A statement showing the Extent & Revenue &c of the 10 villages surrounding Ramaganapartha village, Chikballapur Taluq, Kolar District.

No.	Name of Village	Total Extent of assessed land		Total Assessment			Extent of land under occupation		Assessment of land under occupation			Extent of Inam land assigned to the Joti		Assessment of the Inam land			Jodi payable by the Joti			Remarks.
		A.	G.	Rs.	A.	P.	A.	G.	Rs.	A.	P.	A.	G.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	
1.	Maraganahally	150	28	226	"	"	88	33	134	4	"	2	2	7	12	"	2	5	3	
2.	Chickka Pyayelgurki	255	14	502	4	"	165	33	332	4	"	2	21	5	"	"	"	6	"	
3.	Dodda Pyayelgurki	253	22	468	"	"	108	1	242	4	"	6	27	16	12	"	5	"	"	
4.	Gulakanahally	447	18	856	4	"	255	1	507	12	"	11	21	25	4	"	"	"	"	
5.	Doddathammanahally	177	16	369	12	"	91	19	172	"	"	5	26	10	4	"	1	2	7	
6.	Papinaikanahally	89	11	230	8	"	34	31	100	"	"	2	7	3	8	"	"	"	"	
7.	Inumanchenahally	353	37	601	12	"	219	38	396	"	"	2	20	4	"	"	1	12	"	
8.	Galagere	215	29	541	8	"	129	16	339	"	"	2	32	6	"	"	3	"	"	
9.	Gangare Kalve	702	15	1292	8	"	348	31	646	12	"	5	20	12	"	"	"	"	"	
10.	Ballagere	114	26	165	12	"	41	32	64	"	"	4	30	7	"	"	1	2	7	
11.	Ramaganapartha	96	31	241	"	"	71	"	200	12	"	6	3	8	8	"				
							60	37	186	12	"	4	38	15	"					

Dated 29th May 1898.

P. Raimel Bm

Asst Inspector

Dy Commissioner & Collector 18/9/98

Sub Division officer Chikballapur

Draft as per order

Section
File No
Serial No

Read:—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 1226-337 dated 18th September 1898 from the Deputy Commr. Kolar District regarding the ~~ab~~ allotment, as Service Inam, of certain land, to the Toti of the Ramaganapartthi village, Pirmasagar hobli of the Chikkaballapur taluk.

No. 5342-3. 18.2.99.
R.7.19-92

V.P.

Order thereon.

The godi Ramaganapartthi village of the Pirmasagar hobli Chikkaballapur taluk, was resumed to Government in 1888, the godidar having failed to pay Government dues.

2. During the Survey Settlement of the Chikkaballapur taluk

noted lands, (x) ~~given~~ assigned as Toti Service Inam, by the Jodidar when the village was under Jodi tenure, were fully assessed.

(x)

Survey no.	description	extent a-g	Assess^t as po
7	dry	2-12	3-8
15	dry	1-1	1-8
26	wet	1-25	10-0
	Total	4-38	15-0

3. ~~It is stated~~ The Dy Engr reports that a separate Toti is actually required for the village in question, and that the remuneration in kind, which would be about 200 seers of grain would not attract a man to undertake the Service. ~~The Dy: Commr~~ ~~therefore~~ and recommends the allotment, as Service Inam of Survey No 20, extent 6-3 A.S, assessment ~~Rs~~ 8-8-0 of the Ramagan par the village

4. ~~Under the circumstances represented~~ the Dy: Commr's recommendation, ~~to the allotment, as Service Inam of the land~~ ~~referred~~

~~reference as to above~~ is sanctioned.

~~The assessment on the lands, viz.~~

~~Rs 8-8-0 will be written off the~~

~~accounts and the lands~~ treated

The land will hence forward be

as Service Inam. subject to the payment of local cess etc. as before

5. ~~Government observe the~~

It is observed that no action appears to have been taken

~~absence of any action taken~~

in the matter between 1892 and 1898. — an interval of 6 years. The Dy. Commissioner is requested to ~~will submit a~~ report ~~as to~~ where the papers were during the period and who are the ~~acts~~ officials responsible for the delay

To

" The Dy: Commr., Kolar Dt. re-turning Ver: papers

" " Sirpadar, Rw: Survey, ~~with copy of Statement~~

~~" " Sirpadar~~, Inam. Settlements and ~~with copy of Statement~~

4/2/99

Secretary

4/2/99

Gen. 31.]

1898-99

R 3953

25

Section
File No
Serial No 9

From The Dy Commissioner Kolar District

To

The Secretary to the Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Revenue & Genl Depts

Dated 14
Despatched 19 } May 1899
Received

General No. 4513
No. 1004

Enclosure No. Ver file

Submitting a report on the delay in submission of records connected with allotment of certain service Inam land to Toti of Ramagondanahally village, Chikballapur Taluk.

R
22.5.99

Note Contd & Subd
98
1/6/99

File put up
[illegible] 26/5

No. 45 in 1004

Deputy Commr's Office, Kolar.
Dated 14th May 1899 Camp
Nandi Hills

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Departments.

Sir

Adverting to Government proceedings No: 2342-3 / R.7 19-92 dated 8th February 1899 calling for a report on the delay in the submission of records connected with the allotment of certain Service Inam land to the Loki of the Ramaganpathi village Chikballapur Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith the correspondence ending with the Chikballapur Amildars report received with the Subdivision officers No. 546 dated 21st April 1899 from which it will be seen that the papers were lying for over 4½ years with the Taluk Gumasta Lakshmanarow and for 6 months with another Gumasta Venkata Subbiah. The latter was convicted in the recent Rioting case at Chikballapur and is now undergoing imprisonment in the Bangalore

Central

central gaol. In the case of Gunnacha Lakshma na Row the Munsiff recommends a fine of Rupees 2/. but as this is inadequate.

I have fined him Rupees ten to be deducted from his pay by monthly instalments of Rupees two each.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant.

H H Graby

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

9

(26)

Read:—

Letter No. 4513/1004 dated 14th May 1899 from the Deputy Commr., Kolar District, reporting with reference to the delay of nearly 5 years from 1892 to 1898, noticed in Govt. Proc. No. 5342-3 & R.7.19.92 8th Feb: 1899, in connection with the allotment of Service Inam land to the Toti of Ramaganaparti village, Chikballapur taluk, that the papers were lying for 4½ years with Taluk Gumasta Lakshmanrao, who has been punished with a fine of Rs. 10, and for 6 months with another Gumasta Venkatsubbaiya who was convicted in the recent riot case at Chikballapur & has been undergoing imprisonment.

Order thereon.

Recorded.

8/6/99

Secretary.

Section 2D
Date 2 Dec 1891
Serial No. 10

Submitted to Revenue Commissioner Eastern Division
8/6/99

To V.P.

No. 9189 / R.7.19.92 / R 13/6/99 / 13.

Sir:—
Please see the Commissioner's order calling for report in the above case. Is it necessary to submit this to him for confirmation?

Please send this to Commr. Kolar for returning the papers.

To the Dy. Commr., Kolar
returning the papers.

With reference to the above, has the honor to forward herewith the statement called for by the Government together with a file of Kanarese correspondence ending with Chik-ballapur Amildar's Ittilla No. 878 dated 12th instant from which it will be seen that Toti Mudda who was formerly doing the duties has since discontinued owing to the Inam not having been sanctioned for the Office. One Nimma is said to have since been appointed temporarily. The undersigned therefore recommends the allotment of an Inam to the Toti Office of the village in question.

2. The particulars of the extent and nature of the land selected as Inam has been particularized in the statement enclosed.

Signed/ K. Ramachendrabao
Sub Division Officer,
Chikballapur

(2) From The Deputy Commissioner,
Kolar District.

To The Sub Division Officer, Chikballapur.

Dated 6th } June 1898
Despatched 7th }
No. 4120/2527 } 1897-98.
Enclosure. 1 with a file of papers.

His docket No. 590 dated the 29th Ultimo submitting a statement shewing the extent, revenue &c. of 10 villages surrounding Ramagana parthi village in the Chikballapur Taluk together with the value of the Inam lands appertaining to the totes thereof, as called for in this Office memorandum No. 1632/1075 of the 28th November 1892 for the information of Government in the disposal of the question of allotting certain totes Inam lands for the said Ramagana parthi village.

In returning the statement and the vernacular papers received with the above, has the honor to observe that the figures entered in the statement in regard to the extent and assessment of lands under occupation in the said village do not correspond with the information furnished under the same heads in letter No. 136 of the 7th August 1892